



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,021	06/24/2003	Andrew Feng	AOL0119	3979

22862 7590 11/01/2007
GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUYETLIEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/01/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/606,021	Applicant(s) FENG ET AL.	
	Examiner TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-19, 21-60, 62-72, 74-92, 94-97 and 99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-19, 21-60, 62-72, 74-92, 94-97 and 99 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2179

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 08/08/07.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-19, 21-60, 62-72, 74-92, 94-97 and 99 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 25 and 63 are independent claims. Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 12, 21, 22, 25, 39, 63, 75, 76 are amended claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 12, 25 and 63 are objected to because it is not clear whether the limitation following the term "and/or" is part of the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 1 and 25 are objected to because it is not clear whether the system or the computer readable medium comprises the elements following the term "comprising:".

Appropriate correction is required

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 2-6, 9-11, 26-60 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-6, 9-11, 26-60 and 62 recites the limitation "the system of Claim"; however, claims 1 and 25 are now drawn to a computer readable storage medium. In addition, the systems as recited in line 5 of claims 1 and 25 are only established when the computer storage medium encoded with instructions are loaded into a digital computational device.

Art Unit: 2179

7. Applicant's amendment corrects the previous rejection; therefore, the previous rejection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. Applicant's amendment corrects the previous rejections; therefore, the previous rejections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 25-34, 38-47, 49, 51, 52, 55-57, 62-71, 75-83, 85, 87, 88, 91, 92, 94 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornabene et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0023132 A1; hereinafter Tornabene) in view of Hertzog et al (Pub No US 2003/0069874 A1; hereinafter Hertzog).

Art Unit: 2179

As to claims 25 and 63, Tornabene teaches:

In an Internet based network with a plurality of registered users, wherein each of said users can be a publisher to publish his information to others and/or a subscriber to subscribe shared information from others (e.g., see [0002]; note that when a member of a group shares information among other members of the group, that member is considered a publisher), a computer readable storage medium encoded with instructions, which when loaded into a digital computational device establishes a system for hosting an address card service (e.g., see [0063]-[0064]) comprising:

means for a publisher to set up an address card having multiple views (e.g., a subscriber can enter, retrieve, edit, manipulate subscribe profile data, see [0063]; note that the shared information can be address book having different views such as personal or business, see [0007]);

means for managing said address card (e.g., see [0072]), whereby said publisher designate a sharing relationship to one or more groups of subscribers (e.g., see [0078] and [0075]);

means for updating local copies of said address card possessed by said subscribers (e.g., note that the disclose invention allows subscribers to enter, update, retrieve, store, edit, manipulate group members address information, see [0072] and [0007]; further note that the user profile data may be stored locally on the client device, see [0064]).

Tornabene further teaches the publisher can choose to publish only the personal information desired to be shared with other member of a group and that there are many types of groups such as family, friend, co-workers, classmates, teammates, affiliates, see [0087]-[0088]. However, Tornabene does not expressly teach that each of said views being associated with a different label which, when being clicked, brings said associated view to the front of screen and

Art Unit: 2179

means for delivering different views of a resource to different groups based on different sharing relationships and that wherein a subscriber of said publisher's address card can modify a local copy of said address card, said modified local copy being overwritten by any update published by said publisher based on an on-going subscription.

Hertzog, though, teaches a method and system to automate the updating of personal information within a personal information management application that allows an owning user to publish a selected one or more of sub-sets of personal information to a plurality of groups (e.g., see [0070] and Fig. 4; note that Fig. 4 clearly shows that the disclose invention allows a publisher to publish different views of a personal information to different groups based on different sharing relationships). Hertzog further teaches a user interface that displays a publisher's information having plurality of views such as public, extended, user def. 1, all fields; wherein each of said views being associated with a different label which, when being clicked, brings said associated view to the front of screen and means for delivering different views of a resource to different groups based on different sharing relationships (e.g., see Figs. 4, 12, 14). In addition, Hertzog teaches wherein a subscriber of said publisher's address card can modify a local copy of said address card (e.g., note that a publisher can modify or update local copy of the address card, see [0068] and Fig. 3 item 68, and further see Fig. 9A and [0117]), said modified local copy being overwritten by any update published by said publisher based on an on-going subscription (e.g., note that the modified local copy can be overwritten by any update published by the publisher, see Fig. 3 item 66 and [0067] and further see Fig. 22A).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the feature of sharing contact information among group members as taught by Hertzog to the system for sharing digital resources as taught by Tornabene because each group has different kind of interest; therefore, it would be useful to

deliver the right view of a resource to different kind of group to match the group interest and to avoid misusing information when not needed.

As to claims 26 and 64, Hertzog further teaches address card comprises a page for centrally entering said publisher's contact information, and wherein any of said entered contact information is automatically populated to one or more of said views (e.g., see Figs. 4, 12, 14). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 27 and 65, Hertzog further teaches one of said views is designated as a default view (e.g., see [0078]). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 28 and 66, Hertzog further teaches each of said views can be published separately or in combination with any other one or more of said views (e.g., see Fig. 4 and [0121]). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 29 and 67, Hertzog further teaches each of said views is based on a template containing a set of predefined fields (e.g., see Figs. 12, 14). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 30 and 68, Hertzog further teaches wherein one or more of said views can be customized (e.g., see Figs. 12, 14). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 31 and 69, Hertzog further teaches a virtual button whereby said publisher sets his preferences; and a virtual button whereby said publisher accesses help information (e.g., see Figs. 14, 15B). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claim 32, Hertzog further teaches: a virtual button whereby said publisher sets his preferences (e.g., see Fig. 15B); a virtual button whereby said publisher accesses help information (e.g., see Fig. 14); a dropdown menu showing all categories of contacts in said publisher's address book (e.g., see Fig. 10B); a look up window for searching a subscriber by name (e.g., see Fig. 8); a virtual button for adding a new contact (e.g., see Fig. 23A); a virtual button for editing said publisher's address card (e.g., see Fig. 9B, Fig. 17); and a preview hyperlink for each view of said address card (e.g., see Fig. 9D and Fig. 14), said preview hyperlink linking to a list of subscribers selected for accepting said view (e.g., see Fig. 14). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 33 and 70, Hertzog further teaches adding said publisher's self-expression elements into said address card (e.g., see Figs. 9D and 12). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 34 and 71, Tornabene further teaches means for setting parental control to prevent children from handling said address card (e.g., see Tornabene [0051]).

As to claims 38 and 75, Tornabene further teaches wherein said means for publishing is any of: an e-mail; an immediate popup from an instant messaging system; an indicator in an online address book; and a popup at sign-on (e.g., see Tornabene Fig. 8 and Para [0007]).

As to claims 39 and 76, Tornabene further teaches wherein any of said subscribers receiving a publish offer may take any action of: rejecting said offer; accepting said offer by subscribing said publisher's address card; and accepting said offer by subscribing said publisher's address card and at the same time reciprocating with a publish of said subscriber's address card to said publisher (e.g., see Tornabene Fig. 8 and Para [0006]).

As to claims 40 and 77, Hertzog further teaches wherein a recipient of a publish offer may choose from preferences to automatically subscribe any address card being offered (e.g., see Hertzog Fig. 24). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 41 and 78, Hertzog further teaches wherein when said publisher chooses to publish to a recipient who is not a registered member of said Internet based network, a notification along with an image of said publisher's address card is sent to said recipient via e-mail, said notification comprising a first link which enables said recipient to subscribe future modifications of said publisher's address card (e.g., see Hertzog Fig. 20). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 42 and 79, Hertzog further teaches wherein said notification comprises a second link which enables said recipient to reciprocate said publisher with contact information

Art Unit: 2179

(e.g., see Hertzog Fig. 23A). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claim 43, Hertzog further teaches means for displaying said address card with all data fields editable so that said publisher modifies part or all of entered contact information (e.g., see Figs. 12, 14); a virtual button, by clicking which said publisher is prompted to a confirmation screen wherein said publisher decides whether or not to update said address card in said selected subscribers based on different sharing relationships (e.g., see Figs. 17-19); and a hyperlink which takes said publisher to a screen where said publisher can reset groups, sharing relationships and views of said address card (e.g., see Figs. 17-19). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claim 80, Hertzog further teaches modifying said address card (e.g., see Figs. 12, 14); and configuring update policies (e.g., see Figs. 17-19, 24). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 44-45 and 81-82, Hertzog further teaches wherein said publisher can choose whether a modification on said publisher's address card triggers a notification to said selected subscribers; wherein said notification comprises details of changes made to said publisher's address card (e.g., see Hertzog Figs. 22A-22B). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 46-47 and 83, Hertzog further wherein said address card is incorporated into said publisher's address book from which said selected subscribers' e-mail addresses are extracted (e.g., see Hertzog Figs. 23A-23B), and wherein said address book comprises a virtual button, by selecting a screen name from said address book and then clicking said virtual button, said publisher is prompted to a screen of an editable address card where said publisher completes the contact information of a new contact associated with said selected screen name (e.g., see Hertzog Fig. 8). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 49 and 85, Tornabene further teaches wherein when said publisher deletes any of said subscribers from said publisher's address book, said deleted subscriber's subscription to said publisher's address card is terminated (e.g., see Tornabene [0076]; of course, those skilled in the art will conclude that when a publisher deletes a subscriber from the address book, any other information relating to that subscribers will be deleted as well including subscriber's subscription to said publisher's address).

As to claims 51 and 87, Hertzog further teaches wherein said screen of an editable address card comprises: a drop down menu for setting a group for said new contact (e.g., a check box menus for setting a group for the new contact, see Fig. 26; of course one skilled in the art would have implemented the limitation of a drop down menu to save space); a save button for saving entered data (e.g., see [0021]); and a hyperlink which takes said publisher to a screen for designating which view of said publisher's address card to be shared with said new contact (e.g., see Figs. 17-19). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 52 and 88, Hertzog further teaches said publisher can add a subscriber of said address card into said address book; or remove one or more subscribers of said address card from said address book (e.g., see Figs. 22A-22B). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 55 and 91, Hertzog further teaches wherein said publisher may choose from preferences to automatically publish said publisher's default address card by sending a publish offer to anyone included in said publisher's address book (e.g., see Figs. 4). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 56 and 92, Hertzog further teaches wherein information in said publisher's address card is accessible from a current subscriber's address book either online or offline (e.g., see [0051]). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 57 and 94, Hertzog further teaches wherein separately subscribed views of said publisher's address card are merged as a single entry in a subscriber's address book (e.g., see Figs. 4 and 9D). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

As to claims 62 and 99, Tornabene further teaches wherein a subscriber of said publisher's address card can choose to un-subscribe at any time (e.g., see Tornabene [0076]).

11. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-19, 21-23, 35-37, 72 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornabene et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0023132 A1; hereinafter

Tornabene) in view of Hertzog et al (Pub No US 2003/0069874 A1; hereinafter Hertzog) further in view of Guan (Pub No US 2001/0027472 A1; hereinafter Guan).

As to claim 1, Tornabene teaches:

In an Internet based network with a plurality of registered users, wherein each of said users can be a publisher to publish his information to others and/or a subscriber to subscribe shared information from others, a computer readable storage medium encoded with instructions, which when loaded into a digital computational device establishes a system for sharing digital resources based on a publishing-subscribing model (e.g., see [0002]; note that when a member of a group shares information among other members of the group, that member is considered a publisher), comprising:

means for designating a subscriber as a member of a publisher's community (e.g., step 740 in Fig. 7 and [0076]);

means for creating groups within said publisher's community, each of said groups being based on a predefined sharing relationship between said publisher and the community members of said group (e.g., see [0078] and [0075]); and

Tornabene further teaches the publisher can choose to publish only the personal information desired to be shared with other member of a group and that there are many types of groups such as family, friend, co-workers, classmates, teammates, affiliates, see [0087]-[0088]. However, Tornabene does not expressly teach means for delivering different views of a resource to different groups based on different sharing relationships.

Hertzog, though, teaches a method and system to automate the updating of personal information within a personal information management application that allows an owning user to publish a selected one or more of sub-sets of personal information to a plurality of groups (e.g., see [0070] and Fig. 4; note that Fig. 4 shows that the disclose invention allows a publisher to

Art Unit: 2179

publish different views of a personal information to different groups based on different sharing relationships). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

Hertzog and Tornabene do not teach:

at least one publisher-agent on behalf of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said publisher's software applications to send out announcements and process all requests from subscribers and non-subscriber users; and

at least one subscriber-agent on behalf of a community member of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said community member's software applications to process requests from said publisher and other subscribers.

Guan, though, teaches a system and method that enables a user to dynamically share his/her information with others (e.g., see Abstract); wherein the system further allows a user to request access to another user's personal information (e.g., see page 8 claim 17); wherein the system further comprises:

at least one publisher-agent on behalf of a publisher to serve as a gateway for all of the publisher's software applications to send out announcements and process all requests from subscribers and non-subscriber users (e.g., see [0040]; note that when the information owner change his/her information, the application will send a notice to the information requesters and the requesters will have the instant access to the updated information); and

at least one subscriber-agent on behalf of a community member of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said community member's software applications to process requests from said publisher and other subscribers (e.g., note that the system as taught by Guan allows a user to send out announcements and process all request from subscribers and non-subscribers users, see page 8 claims 17-21).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the system of dynamical information sharing as taught by Guan to the system for sharing digital resources as taught by Tornabene and Hertzog to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation for the combination is to achieve a more efficient and effective communication and information exchange (e.g., see Guan [0040]).

As to claim 12, Tornabene teaches:

A method for sharing digital resources through an Internet based network which has a plurality of registered users, wherein each of said users can be a publisher to publish his information to others and/or a subscriber to subscribe shared information from others (e.g., see [0002]; note that when a member of a group shares information among other members of the group, that member is considered a publisher), said method comprising the steps of:

a publisher creating one or more views of a resource (e.g., a subscriber can enter, retrieve, edit, manipulate subscribe profile data, see [0063]; note that the shared information can have different views such as personal or business, see [0007]);

designating a subscriber as a member of said publisher's community (e.g., step 740 in Fig. 7 and [0076]);

creating groups within said publisher's community, each group being based on a predefined sharing relationship between said publisher and the community members of said each group (e.g., see [0078] and [0075]);

announcing availability of one or more views of said resource to one or more subscribers of said network (e.g., receiving updated information from the user interface, see [0011]);

designating a subscriber who subscribes one or more views of said resource to one or more of said groups (e.g., step 740 in Fig. 7 and [0076]; note that a subscriber may create and join several different groups, see [0075]); and

Tornabene further teaches the publisher can choose to publish only the personal information desired to be shared with other member of a group and that there are many types of groups such as family, friend, co-workers, classmates, teammates, affiliates, see [0087]-[0088]. However, Tornabene does not expressly teach means for delivering different views of a resource to different groups based on different sharing relationships.

Hertzog, though, teaches a method and system to automate the updating of personal information within a personal information management application that allows an owning user to publish a selected one or more of sub-sets of personal information to a plurality of groups (e.g., see [0070] and Fig. 4; note that Fig. 4 clearly shows that the disclose invention allows a publisher to publish different views of a personal information to different groups based on different sharing relationships). Thus, combining Hertzog and Tornabene would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 63 above.

Hertzog and Tornabene do not teach:

at least one publisher-agent on behalf of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said publisher's software applications to send out announcements and process all requests from subscribers and non-subscriber users; and

at least one subscriber-agent on behalf of a community member of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said community member's software applications to process requests from said publisher and other subscribers.

Guan, though, teaches a system and method that enables a user to dynamically share his/her information with others (e.g., see Abstract); wherein the system further allows a user to request access to another user's personal information (e.g., see page 8 claim 17); wherein the system further comprises:

at least one publisher-agent on behalf of a publisher to serve as a gateway for all of the publisher's software applications to send out announcements and process all requests from subscribers and non-subscriber users (e.g., see [0040]; note that); and

at least one subscriber-agent on behalf of a community member of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said community member's software applications to process requests from said publisher and other subscribers (e.g., note that the system as taught by Guan allows a user to send out announcements and process all request from subscribers and non-subscribers users, see page 8 claims 17-21). Thus, combining Hertzog, Tornabene and Guan would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claims 2 and 13, Tornabene further teaches: each member of said publisher's community belongs to any of: one of said groups; more than one of said groups; and none of said groups (e.g., a subscriber can join several different group, see [0075]).

As to claims 3 and 14, Tornabene further teaches said sharing relationships are based on any of: a privilege to receive a copy of said resource from said publisher; a privilege to read said resource in a central repository; and a privilege to update said resource (e.g., a group member or subscriber may also create a personal profile and make it available to other group members, see [0078]; note that data is available for other members to copy).

As to claims 4 and 15, Tornabene further teaches: said means for creating groups further comprises:

means for processing a non-subscriber user's request for sharing (e.g., note that a non-member can join a group for sharing resource, see [0076]);

Art Unit: 2179

means for processing any subscriber's request to join any of said groups (e.g., subscribers may join several different groups, see [0075]; for this reason, it is obvious to those skilled in the art that there is a means for processing a request to join a group); and

means for terminating a subscriber or a non-subscriber user from any of said sharing relationships (e.g., the group owner has the ability to remove members and delete content, see [0076]).

Hertzog further teaches announcing availability of a view or views of said resource to one or more subscribers who have not yet subscribed to access said view or views (e.g., see [0155]). Thus, combining Hertzog, Tornabene and Guan would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claims 5 and 16, Tornabene further teaches: said means for processing a non-subscriber user's request comprises an authorization for any of: one-time sharing; ongoing sharing, reject, and ignore (e.g., note that a request for ongoing sharing can be extended to member who are not subscribers, see [0076]).

As to claim 6, Tornabene further teaches: means for processing a subscriber's request further comprises: means for automatically approving said subscriber's request (e.g., see [0090]).

As to claims 10 and 23, Hertzog further teaches whenever said resource is modified by said publisher any local copy of said resource accessible by any member of said publisher's community is automatically updated (e.g., see Hertzog Fig. 9B, Para [0040] and [0181]). Thus, combining Hertzog, Tornabene and Guan would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 17, Guan further teaches keeping said non-subscriber user's request as pending; rejecting said non-subscriber user's request; notifying said non-subscriber user the status of his request (e.g., see page 8 claim 21). Thus, combining Hertzog, Tornabene and Guan would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 12 above.

As to claim 18, Tornabene further teaches processing a subscriber's request comprises a step to allow said subscriber for any of: one-time sharing; and ongoing sharing (e.g., see Fig. 8).

As to claim 19, Tornabene further teaches automatically approving said subscriber's request (e.g., see [0090]); notifying said subscriber the status of his request (e.g., see [0070]).

As to claims 8 and 21, Guan further teaches wherein said at least one publisher-agent automatically generates responses according to said publisher's preferences (e.g., see page 8 claim 21). Thus, combining Hertzog, Tornabene and Guan would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 12 above.

As to claims 9 and 22, Tornabene further teaches wherein said at least one subscriber-agent automatically generates responses according to said community member's preferences (e.g., see [0082]).

As to claims 35 and 72, Tornabene and Hertzog teach the limitations of claims 25 and 63 above. Tornabene and Hertzog do not teach publisher can view any of: an accepted subscription; a rejected subscription; and a pending subscription. Guan further teaches publisher can view any of: an accepted subscription; a rejected subscription; and a pending

subscription (e.g., see page 8 claim 21). Thus, combining Tornabene, Hertzog and Guan would meet the claim limitations for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claims 36 and 74, Hertzog further teaches publisher can un-publish to any of said subscribers (e.g., see Fig. 19). Thus, combining Tornabene, Hertzog and Guan would meet the claim limitations for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 37, Tornabene further teaches a publish offer lapses after a predefined period of time (e.g., see [0082]).

12. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornabene et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0023132 A1; hereinafter Tornabene) in view of Hertzog et al (Pub No US 2003/0069874 A1; hereinafter Hertzog) further in view of Guan (Pub No US 2001/0027472 A1; hereinafter Guan) and further in view of Hu (published article at http://news.com.com/Yahoo+adds+spam+filter+to+email,+but+will+it+work/2100-1023_3-233785.html, titled "Yahoo adds spam filter to email, but will it work?", published on 01/02/2002, pages 1-2; hereinafter Hu).

As to claims 11 and 24, Tornabene, Hertzog and Guan teach the limitations of claims 1 and 12 for the same reason as discussed above. However, Tornabene, Hertzog and Guan do not expressly teach a spam control mechanism that comprises: rate limiting policies; rate limiting notification to a unique receiver; restriction on number of publishes that can be made in a single transaction; and restriction on notification messages.

Hu, though, teaches a spam control mechanism that will automatically determine whether email being sent to a user is unsolicited and then take appropriate action (e.g., see Hu page 1). Although Hu does not teach how this mechanism is implemented, it would have been

Art Unit: 2179

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the spam control mechanism that comprises rate limiting policies; rate limiting notification to a unique receiver; restriction on number of publishes that can be made in a single transaction; and restriction on notification messages because Hu suggests to the skilled artisan that spam overburdens internet service provider's servers and that net users hat having their email in-boxes filled with unwanted email (e.g., see Hu page 1) and because spam control can be implemented in many ways (Yahoo implements one way, and Hotmail implements another way). The motivation for the combination is to reduce the unwanted message and to save users time which otherwise would have been wasted in sifting through their mail box.

13. Claims 48 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornabene et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0023132 A1; hereinafter Tornabene) in view of Hertzog et al (Pub No US 2003/0069874 A1; hereinafter Hertzog) further in view of Padwick et al (ebook titled "special edition using Microsoft Outlook 2000", published 05/12/1999, pp 1-3; hereinafter Padwick) and further in view of Slipstick (published article titled "to add addresses automatically", published 06/07/2002, pp 1-2; hereinafter Slipstick).

As to claims 48 and 84, Tornabene and Hertzog teach the limitations of claims 47 and 83 for the same reasons as discussed above. However, Tornabene and Hertzog do not expressly teach recipient's email address is added into a publisher's address book. Padwick teaches a Microsoft Outlook function that allows a user to share contacts with other users by right-clicking a Contact item to display its context menu. Choose Forward and Outlook displays a Message from with the selected Contact item as an attachment (e.g., see Padwick page 3; note that the recipient can be any user's email including a group member or non-member).

Art Unit: 2179

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the limitation of allowing a publisher to publish to a recipient any Contact item to achieve the claimed invention. As suggested by Padwick, the motivation is for a publisher to publish the contact information to non-member of a group using email.

Tornabene, Hertzog and Padwick do not teach that the recipient's e-mail address is automatically added into said publisher's address book. Slipstick, though, teaches that using the Microsoft Outlook 2000 as mentioned in Padwick's teaching, a user can automatically saving recipient addresses to the user's address book (e.g., see Slipstick page 1). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement this limitation to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation for the combination is to automatically add new addresses to Contacts when a user replies or sends an email to another user to quickly and accurately save contact for later use.

14. **Claims 53, 54, 58, 59 and 89, 90, 95, 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornabene et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0023132 A1; hereinafter Tornabene) in view of Hertzog et al (Pub No US 2003/0069874 A1; hereinafter Hertzog) further in view of Padwick et al (ebook titled "special edition using Microsoft Outlook 2000", published 05/12/1999, pp 1-3; hereinafter Padwick).**

As to claims 53 and 89, Tornabene and Hertzog teach the limitations of claims 52 and 88 for the same reasons as discussed above. Tornabene further teaches the publisher can send an invitation to a prospective member to join the group and the user can response by clicking on the link (e.g., see Tornabene [0082]). However, Tornabene and Hertzog do not expressly teach any registered user of said network who receives a copy of said publisher's address card in an e-mail can save said address card into said any registered user's address

Art Unit: 2179

book by clicking an accept link embedded in said e-mail. Padwick, though, teaches this limitation on page 3 (e.g., when a recipient receives the message, that recipient drags the attached Contact item from the message onto the Contacts icon in the Outlook bar; Outlook adds the contact into the recipient's Contact folder). Thus, combining Tornabene, Hertzog and Padwick would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 48 and 84 above.

As to claims 54 and 90, Tornabene and Hertzog teach the limitations of claims 52 and 88 for the same reasons as discussed above. Tornabene further teaches the publisher can send an invitation to a prospective member to join the group and the user can response by clicking on the link and that when the response is positive, the host will add the user to the current group and provide automatically updated services to members of the group (e.g., see Tornabene [0082]-[0083]. Padwick teaches a function that allows the publisher to publish his address card in an email and the receiver can then save the address card into the user's address book (e.g., see Padwick page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to implement the function of the receiver at the same time share his own address card with said publisher by clicking an accept and share link embedded in said e-mail because Tornabene suggests to the skilled artisan that the receiver's response will contain information relating to the prospective so that the host can add this user into the group and provides automatically updated services to current members of the group (e.g., see Tornabene [0083]).

As to claims 58 and 95, Tornabene and Hertzog teach the limitations of claims 46 and 83 for the same reasons as discussed above. However, Tornabene and Hertzog do not expressly teach that means for detecting a duplicate entry of said publisher's screen name in a subscriber's address book; wherein when said duplicate entry is detected, said subscriber can

Art Unit: 2179

choose to overwrite said duplicate entry with said publisher's address card or keep said publisher's address card as a separate entry. Padwick, though, teaches these limitations on page 2 (e.g., see Fig. 9.18). Thus, combining Tornabene, Hertzog and Padwick would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 48 and 84 above.

As to claims 59 and 96, Tornabene and Hertzog teach the limitations of claims 46 and 83 for the same reasons as discussed above. Tornabene further teaches the publisher can send an invitation to a prospective member to join the group and the user can response by clicking on the link (e.g., see Tornabene [0082]). Padwick teaches a function that allows the publisher to publish his address card in an email and the receiver can then save the address card into the user's address book (e.g., see Padwick page 3; of course those skilled in the art would have known that the receiver can forward an email with the attached address card to a third party user, and the third party can add this address card to his address book). Thus, combining Tornabene, Hertzog and Padwick would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 48 and 84 above.

15. **Claims 60 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornabene et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0023132 A1; hereinafter Tornabene) in view of Hertzog et al (Pub No US 2003/0069874 A1; hereinafter Hertzog) further in view of Padwick et al (ebook titled "special edition using Microsoft Outlook 2000", published 05/12/1999, pp 1-3; hereinafter Padwick) and further in view of Microsoft TechNet (published White Paper titled "Microsoft Office 2003 Editions Security Whitepaper", published on 4/1/2003, pages 1-2; hereinafter TechNet).**

As to claims 60 and 97, Tornabene, Hertzog, and Padwick teach the limitations of claims 59 and 96 for the same reasons as discussed above. However, Tornabene, Hertzog and Padwick do not expressly teach that setting a parameter to prevent a receiver from forwarding the address card. TechNet, though, teaches a security feature called Information Rights Management (IRM) that can be used in Outlook 2003 to prevent email from forwarding; wherein the protected messages get encrypted before they are sent and automatically get decrypted when the intended recipient opens them (e.g., see TechNet page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the IRM feature as taught by TechNet to the system and method of publishing personal information to other users as taught by Tornabene, Hertzog and Padwick to give the publisher the control access to his/her email content once it leaves his/her computer.

16. Claims 50 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tornabene et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0023132 A1; hereinafter Tornabene) in view of Hertzog et al (Pub No US 2003/0069874 A1; hereinafter Hertzog) further in view of Chen et al. (Pub No US 2002/0049751 A1; hereinafter Chen).

As to claims 50 and 86, Tornabene and Hertzog teach the limitations of claims 49 and 85 for the same reasons as discussed above. However, Tornabene and Hertzog do not expressly teach that when a subscriber of said publisher's address card chooses to delete said publisher's address card, said subscriber's subscription to the publisher's address card is terminated. Chen, though, teaches a method and system for managing contact information that allows any changes in the user's record or his contact's record can be seen by the other user from his contact (e.g., see Abstract); wherein when the user delete a contact from his/her contact list, the deletion completely removes a bi-directional link between the two user and other

user, and the user will not be able to read any future updates in the other user's profile (e.g., see Chen [0058]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the limitation of terminating the subscriber's subscription to the publisher's address card when the subscriber chooses to delete the publisher's address card to give a user a choice not to receive the publisher's information when the user is no longer interested in the published information to give the user/subscriber the control on what kind of information he receives.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's remarks filed 8/08/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- ♦ Applicant's arguments that the cited prior art do not teach or suggest the limitations:

at least one publisher-agent on behalf of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said publisher's software applications to send out announcements and process all requests from subscribers and non-subscriber users;

at least one subscriber-agent on behalf of a community member of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said community member's software applications to process requests from said publisher and other subscribers.

Specifically, the Applicant argues that there is no teaching or suggestion that the web site constitutes a gateway for all of said publisher's software applications or a gateway for all of said community member's software applications to process requests (e.g., see Applicant's remark pages 24 through page 25, paragraph 2).

Art Unit: 2179

Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In addition, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). And that the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not merely what the references expressly teach, but what they would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made." *In re Lamberti*, 545 F.2d 747, 750, 192 USPQ 278, 280 (CCPA 1976). In this case, the prior art of Guan teaches:

at least one publisher-agent on behalf of a publisher to serve as a gateway for all of the publisher's software applications to send out announcements and process all requests from subscribers and non-subscriber users (e.g., see [0040]; note that when the information owner change his/her information, the application will send a notice to the information requesters and the requesters will have the instant access to the updated information); and

at least one subscriber-agent on behalf of a community member of said publisher to serve as a gateway for all of said community member's software applications to process requests from said publisher and other subscribers (e.g., note that the system as taught by Guan allows a user to send out announcements and process all request from subscribers and non-subscribers users, see page 8 claims 17-21).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the system of dynamical information sharing as taught by Guan to the system for sharing digital resources as taught by Tornabene and Hertzog to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation for the combination is to achieve a more efficient and effective communication and information exchange (e.g., see Guan [0040]).

♦ Applicant's arguments that the cited prior art do not teach or suggest the limitation of wherein a subscriber of said publisher's address card can modify a local copy of said address card, said modified local copy being overwritten by any update published by said publisher based on an on-going subscription. Specifically, the Applicant argues that the prior art of Hertzog does not teach or suggest the limitation of said modified local copy being overwritten by any update published by said publisher based on an on-going subscription (e.g., see Applicant's remark page 25, Paras 3-7).

Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not merely what the references expressly teach, but what they would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made." In re Lamberti, 545 F.2d 747, 750, 192 USPQ 278, 280 (CCPA 1976). In this case, the prior art of Hertzog teaches these limitations in several different places; specifically, the prior art of Hertzog teaches a method and a system to automate the updating of personal information within a personal information management application that allows an owning user to publish a selected one or more of subsets of personal information to a plurality of groups (e.g., see [0070] and Fig. 4; note that Fig. 4 clearly shows that the disclose invention allows a publisher to publish different views of a personal information to different groups based on different sharing relationships). Hertzog further teaches wherein a subscriber of said publisher's address card can modify a local copy of said address card (e.g., note that a publisher can modify or update local copy of the address

Art Unit: 2179

card, see [0068] and Fig. 3 item 68, and further see Fig. 9A and [0117]), said modified local copy being overwritten by any update published by said publisher based on an on-going subscription (e.g., note that the modified local copy can be overwritten by any update published by the publisher, see Fig. 3 item 66 and [0067] and further see Fig. 22A).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the feature of sharing contact information among group members as taught by Hertzog to the system for sharing digital resources as taught by Tornabene because each group has different kind of interest; therefore, it would be useful to deliver the right view of a resource to different kind of group to match the group interest and to avoid misusing information when not needed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any

Art Unit: 2179

way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T.T
10/15/2007

Lien Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 2179


WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER